Calhoun
Institutional Archive of the Naval Postgraduate School

Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive

DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations 1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

1993-09

Assessing research productivity of academic MIS departments

Allen, Clayton R.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/26892

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY

Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

http://www.nps.edu/library

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Assessing Research Productivity of Academic MIS Departments

by

Clayton R. Allen
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.S., University of Georgia, 1985

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 1993

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a Report Security Classification: Unclassified		1b Restrictive Markings			
2a Security Classification Authority		3 Distribution/Availability of Report Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			
2b Declassification/Downgrading Schedule					
4 Performing Organization Report Number(s)		5 Monitoring Organization Report Number(s)			
6a Name of Performing Organization Naval Postgraduate School	6b Office Symbol *(if applicable)* 37	7a Name of Monitoring Organization Naval Postgraduate School			
6c Address *(city, state, and ZIP code)* Monterey CA 93943-5000		7b Address *(city, state, and ZIP code)* Monterey CA 93943-5000			
8a Name of Funding/Sponsoring Organization	6b Office Symbol *(if applicable)*	9 Procurement Instrument Identification Number			
Address *(city, state, and ZIP code)*		10 Source of Funding Numbers			
		Program Element No	Project No	Task No	Work Unit Accession

11 Title *(include security classification)* ASSESSING RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY OF ACADEMIC MIS DEPARTMENTS

12 Personal Author(s) Clayton R. Allen

13a Type of Report Master's Thesis	13b Time Covered From To	14 Date of Report *(year, month, day)* September 1993	15 Page Count 66

16 Supplementary Notation The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position o
Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

17 Cosati Codes			18 Subject Terms *(continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)*
Field	Group	Subgroup	Departmental Ranking, Prestige Weighting Factor, Per Capita Weighting Factor, Obje Measure of Quality, Research Productivity

19 Abstract *(continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)*

This study ranks academic information systems (IS) departments according to the publishing record of their faculty members. The ranking presented in two forms: by a per capita ranking and by a ranking in which the frequency of publication is multiplied by prestige weights for journal. The rankings are presented in cumulative form for the 1985-92 period and are also broken down on an annual basis to track trend changes in academic production. Recommendations are made for future research and implications are drawn for the application of the techn developed here for the evaluation of the research production of DoD laboratories and schools.

20 Distribution/Availability of Abstract _X_ unclassified/unlimited __ same as report __ DTIC users	21 Abstract Security Classification Unclassified	
22a Name of Responsible Individual William J. Haga	22b Telephone *(include Area Code)* 656-2161	22c Office Symbol AS/HG

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted
All other editions are obsolete

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS
UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

This study ranks academic information systems (IS) departments according to the publishing record of their faculty members. The rankings are presented in two forms: by a per capita ranking and by a ranking in which the frequency of publication is multiplied by prestige weights for each journal. The rankings are presented in cumulative form for the 1985-92 period and are also broken down on an annual basis to track trends and changes in academic production. Recommendations are made for future research and implications are drawn for the application of the techniques developed here for the evaluation of the research production of DoD laboratories and schools.

A371046
C.1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW 3
   A. NIEMI 3
   B. STAHL, LEAP, AND WEI 5
   C. VOGEL AND WETHERBE 7
   D. GROVER, SEGARS, AND SIMON 7
III. METHODOLOGY 12
   A. RESEARCH 12
   B. CALCULATION 14
   C. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED 15
IV. DISCUSSION 18
   A. INTRODUCTION 18
   B. COMPARISON WITH GROVER, ET AL. 20
V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 22
   A. RECOMMENDATIONS 22
   B. CONCLUSIONS 23
APPENDIX A (Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings) 25
APPENDIX B (Academic Departmental Rankings) 41
APPENDIX C (Top Institutional Representation in MIS Literature) 57
APPENDIX D (Hayes and Huskey Results) 58
LIST OF REFERENCES 59
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST 61

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA

I. INTRODUCTION

MIS departments have been one of the fastest growing in recent years (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 5). A common measure of academic departmental productivity is research publication in academic journals. This type of measure is used to rank academic departments. Such rankings are used to determine compensation and career tracking of faculty and to justify research grants. Ranking studies have been done in MIS (Grover, et al., 1992), general business (Niemi, 1988b), management (Stahl, et al., 1988), marketing (Niemi, 1988a), and finance (Klemkowsky and Tuttle, 1977, Niemi, 1987). These rankings are useful to institutions in attracting students, staff, and research dollars. As a minimum they are valuable to those who want to know prestige rankings of institutions (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 5). In a methodological departure, this study ranks academic MIS departments by weighing the prestige of journals provided by Hayes and Huskey (1993) as well as weighing the faculty size difference between the departments. This thesis will explore the methods and criteria previously used to assign rankings. It will also explore the effects of combining the journal weights and a *per capita* method in the ranking process.

The purpose of this study is to develop an objective measure identifying the institutions who were leaders of IS research from 1985 to 1992. It would be useful to see how faculty size effects IS departmental rankings. It would be useful to see if there are any trends or stability of rankings over time. This method can be used by DoD to justify research organizations during budget reviews or when competing for resources.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. NIEMI

Niemi has authored many academic departmental ranking studies. His domain includes finance, marketing and business departments. His purpose was to create an objective measure of quality of academic departments to avoid the "...pitfalls of subjective evaluations based on name and reputation" (Niemi, 1988b, pp. 2-3). He felt opinion surveys were important but "...particularly weak when used to evaluate specific programs within academic institutions" (Niemi, 1988b, pg. 1). Consequently, Niemi (1987) decided to use the quantity of research published in academic journals as an objective measure of quality. He emphasized that research publication is not a complete measure of quality. However, it is universally recognized by academic institutions as crucial for assessment of premier programs (Niemi, 1987, pg. 1390).

Niemi's (1987, 1988a, 1988b) methodology was based on the number of pages published normalized to a specific page size. For example, Niemi averaged the number of characters per page from twenty randomly selected pages of a specifically chosen journal. This became the standard number of characters per page. This journal was assigned an adjustment coefficient of 1.00. An average number of characters per page was taken for all other journals used in the study. These journals were assigned adjustment coefficients based on the standard number of characters per page. These adjustment coefficients were multiplied by the number of characters per page per article to standardize the different journal formats (Niemi, 1988b, pg. 3 and pg. 15).

In his 1988 studies Niemi used a *per capita* method to account for differences in departmental size. No prior attempt had been made to produce rankings taking into account these differences. Ignoring this factor would potentially result in lower a ranking for smaller departments (Niemi, 1988a, pg. 9).

One study divided authorship credit by co-authors (Niemi, 1987, pg. 1390). For example, an article with three authors from three different institutions each received one third scoring credit of the total article. Another study gave institutions full scoring credit for articles with co-authors (Niemi, 1988b, pg. 3).

Niemi (1988b) was the only author who urged caution when interpreting the results of the ranking study. His studies were produced with the intention that the information would be useful to academia. He warned against drawing "unwarranted conclusions" realizing the limitations of using only research publication in academic journals as a measure of quality (Niemi, 1988b, pg. 3).

He does not provide a specific comparison between the subjective and objective results in any of his studies. However, Niemi (1988b) stated that his results confirm many long held opinions in academia concerning departmental quality. He also stated his findings challenged popular perceptions regarding school rankings (Niemi, 1988b, pg. 2).

B. STAHL, LEAP, AND WEI

Stahl, et al., (1988) were interested in using the quantity of research publication in management journals as a measure of productivity. They wanted to see who the leading research institutions were. They attempted to answer several questions regarding journal readership, ranking stability between journals, ranking stability over time, ranking variations due to faculty size, in-house editorship effect, and ranking methodology criterion comparison (Stahl, et al., 1988, pg. 716).

Stahl, et al., (1988) used two consensus sets of journals as their source of data. The first set was published by Coe and Weinstock (1984) without a prestige weighted factor for the journals. The second set was published by Sharplin and Mabry (1985) with prestige weighting criteria for the journals.

The results were separated by journals whose primary readership was practitioners and whose primary readership was academic. They took in-house editorship and differences in faculty size into account.

Stahl, et al., (1988) found that both total publication and *per capita* publication measures were significant based on Spearman correlations. They made the following recommendations based on their results. First, they recommend separating journal sets used for ranking studies based on target readership. The journal set should be selected from journals relevant to the target audience of the proposed study. Second they recommend examining the *per capita* issue in future studies. They had difficulty in accurately determining faculty size due to different organizational structures of the academic institutions. They finally recommend studying the in-house editorship effect further. They stated faculty at institutions that housed full-time editorial offices often had an advantage of easy access to the editors, better knowledge of editorial practices, and were more likely to share common views, creating an advantage in publishing their research (Stahl, et al., 1988, pp. 715-717).

C. VOGEL, WETHERBE, AND LENDING

Vogel and Wetherbe (1984) sought a taxonomy to categorize MIS research, to rank MIS journals by volume and type of research published, and to note differences in journal publication preference of leading MIS institutions. The taxonomy created by Vogel and Wetherbe (1984) was designed to aid others locating desired areas of research. The journal set chosen was based on a previous study by Hamilton and Ives (1983), and the results of a mail survey conducted in 1980. Their study covered research publication from 1977 to 1983. Their ranking included the 20 leading institutions. The ranking was based on publication productivity. Lending and Wetherbe (1992) updated the previous study done by Vogel and Wetherbe (1984), covering 1984 to 1990. It appeared that ranking of institutions was secondary to research characterization in both studies.

D. GROVER, SEGARS, AND SIMON

The study by Grover, et al., (1992) is the most recent ranking study of IS departments. They were influenced by previous academic business department ranking studies conducted by Klemkosky and Tuttle (1977), Niemi (1987, 1988a, 1988b), and Stahl, et al., (1988). They wanted to apply previously used objective methods assess and rank academic IS departments. They emphasized that while it takes more than just quantity of research publication to assess quality, it is an important element in an objective measurement. Therefore, it was the basis for their research (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 5).

Their study covered research publication from 1982 to 1991. They ranked academic MIS departments based on the number pages published in selected academic journals. This was multiplied by a weighting factor for those journals. The journal set and weighting factors used by Grover, et al., were taken from a study done by Gillenson and Stutz (1991) ranking 38 MIS publications. The study by Gillenson and Stutz (1991) was based on a survey of 269 schools and the combined opinions of 135 chairman and senior professors in the IS field (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 6). The results were based on a scale of 0 to 4. The top five journals were used and their respective mean scores are as follows:

JOURNAL	WEIGHT
Management Science	(3.61)
MIS Quarterly	(3.54)
Communications of the ACM	(3.39)

Decision Sciences (2.93)

Journal of MIS (2.84)

Although not included in the study by Gillenson and Stutz (1991), Grover, et al., (1992) felt *Information Systems Research* was highly regarded by IS academics and included it in their journal set. It was assigned a value equal to *Management Science* because of its' high regard and because it is published by the same publisher as *Management Science*.

Grover, et al., (1992) selected all articles from *MISQ, ISR, JMIS*. Only MIS specific articles were selected from *Decision Sciences* and *Management Science*. Articles were selected based these keywords: Information Systems, MIS, DSS, Human Information Processing, Information Economics, etc. (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 6). Articles were selected from *Communications of the ACM* that were relevant to "social impacts of computing", "management of computing", and "human aspects of computing" (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 6). This study used the same method to standardize page size as Niemi (1988b) with *MIS Quarterly* used as the standard journal.

Grover, et al., (1992) divide scoring credit to an institution for articles with co-authors. For example, an article has three authors, two from University A and one from B College. University A will receive two thirds scoring credit while B College will receive only one third scoring credit for the article. Authorship was credited to an institution based on the affiliation printed in the publishing journal. This means that visiting professors were given credit for the university they were currently assigned at the time the article was published, not their parent university.

Grover, et al., (1992) felt a weighted *per capita* factor was unnecessary. They emphasized that a *per capita* ranking is highly sensitive to the productivity of a few individuals which would skew the results. They also felt that the readership would be more interested in identifying leading research institutions than the institutions with the highest levels of research per capita (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 6).

The results of the top 50 MIS institutions were tabulated in two five-year periods and an overall ten-year period. Their results were tabulated for these time periods: 1982-1991, 1982-1986, and 1987-1991. Appendix C. contains the summary results from 1982-1991. Grover, et al., (1992) noted an overall increase in publication productivity over the periods based on a Spearman's rank order correlation. They also noted a restructuring of the top producing schools over the period. They assumed that a drop in rank could be attributed to faculty turnover and not necessarily a decline in productivity (Grover, et al., 1992, pg. 7). Grover, et al., (1992) did not include a comparison between objective and subjective ranking results.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. RESEARCH

A consensus journal set was required to begin gathering data. Hayes and Huskey (1993) provided a list of 24 MIS and MIS related journals ranked and weighted by their prestige. This list is contained in Appendix D. The following journals were used in this study:

Rank	Journal	Prestige Weight	# Articles
1.	*Management Science*	12.57	99
3.	*Communications of the ACM*	11.09	191
4.	*IEEE Transactions on IS*	10.88	70
5.	*Admin Science Quarterly*	10.58	1
6.	*ACM Transactions on IS*	10.10	28
7.	*MIS Quarterly*	10.01	229
8.	*ACM Survey*	9.97	17
9.	*Harvard Business Review*	9.90	12
10.	*Academy of Management Journal*	9.62	9
12.	*Decision Science*	9.14	162
14.	*Journal of MIS*	8.98	167

Every journal from the Hayes and Huskey (1993) set was examined for feature articles with authors employed by an academic IS departments. It was assumed all articles written by IS department personnel were pertinent to the IS field. The period of time covered was 1985 to 1992. A database was created recording institution name, article title, author(s), journal, and date (year only). Article selection by Grover, et al., (1992) used keywords and key phrases pertinent to IS. This method could lead to selection of articles authored by non-IS department personnel and consequently not used in this study. The articles were not normalized to a specific page length. If a multi-authored article was comprised of persons from private industry or public service, and academic IS departments it was selected. Scoring credit was then awarded to the academic IS departments. Due to organizational structure differences, the 1992 DIRECTORY OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACULTY was used to determine if a department existed for scoring credit.

All authors of multi-authored articles received full scoring credit for their institution. Niemi (1988b) felt co-authored articles brought the same prestige to their respective universities as did single authored articles.

In the course of research it was noted that the larger departments generally had the most prolific personnel. The *per capita* weighting factor was used to account for the differences in department size. The *per capita* weighting factor was derived by taking the number of personnel from each department and dividing it by the number of personnel in the smallest department. Since the smallest department size was one faculty member, this caused low scores for institutions with large MIS faculties. Institutions with large faculty size were affected by the *per capita* weighting factor.

B. CALCULATION

The departmental score was calculated as follows (For a given year and institution):

$$\Sigma(\text{articles/publication} * \text{JWF} * \text{PCWF})$$

JWF=journal weighting factor
PCWF=*per capita* weighting factor

For example, for the University of Georgia, 1992, the number of articles credited to University of Georgia were summed then multiplied by their respective journal weighting factors. This figure was multiplied by the *per capita* weighting factor for University of Georgia for a total *per capita* score.

An annual department score was calculated for institutions with research published in the journal set. The annual scores were summed for a cumulative ranking. A comparison ranking was calculated without the *per capita*. The results are contained in Appendix B.

C. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

The domain of IS is relatively new and diverse, hence the boundaries tend to blur with other disciplines. Vogel and Wetherbe (1984) state "...it is often difficult to discern where MIS begins in effectively distinguishing it from other disciplines".

IS is a combination of other fields, embodying characteristics not only from data processing but those of computer science, management science, administrative science, telecommunications, and human behavioral sciences. This leads to the problem of determining ownership. IS departments can be found throughout academia as stand alone departments or a combination of departments such as computer science and information systems. They also can be embedded in business, management, decision or administrative science departments. This caused difficulty in accurately identifying IS departments and the number of faculty at each institution. Finally, some IS personnel are housed in non-IS departments and not specifically listed as a separate department. For example, the Naval Postgraduate School has specified IS faculty members but no IS Department. Their parent department is administrative sciences. The University of Pennsylvania lists their IS faculty under the decision sciences department. The 1992 DIRECTORY OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACULTY assisted in determining if a department existed and the faculty size. This directory only covers the United States and Canada, effectively eliminating institutions from Europe and Southeast Asia from the scope of this study.

Another problem involved the assignment of the *per capita* score. Larger state institutions have many campuses under the same name, e.g. the University of Texas, University of California, California State University. In most cases, campus distinctions were given or could be made via cross referencing. In rare cases where absolute determination was impossible, an average of department size was taken from the institution in question to give the appropriate score. For example, the University of Texas has four campuses, Arlington, Austin, El Paso, and San Antonio.

For a University of Texas entry with no discernible campus ownership, its' *per capita* factor was computed using the department size averaged from the four campuses.

IV. FINDINGS

A. INTRODUCTION

The ranking results with the *per capita* factor are contained in Appendix A. The first three pages are cumulative rankings, covering 1985 through 1992. Subsequent pages are the annual ranking results. The comparison ranking results, without the *per capita* factor, are contained in Appendix B.

There are obvious differences between the two ranking results, but the differences in the top ten institutions were not as extreme as expected. There was a reordering of the higher ranking institutions over time. The leading institutions in the early part of the period were surpassed by others towards 1992. This was due to an increase in research publication by the new leaders, not a decrease by the former leaders. There was little difference in the scores of the leaders of 1985 and the same schools in 1992. Their productivity was the same in 1992 as it was in 1985. For example, Ohio State University had a *per capita* score of 3.35 in 1985 and a *per capita* score of 3.17 in 1992. In 1985 their ranking was number eight, but in 1992 their ranking had dropped to 29. The top *per capita* score in 1985 was 11.72 by SUNY-Albany compared to a score of 20.71 by Rice in 1992.

The same holds true for the results without the *per capita* factor. New York University was the number one school in 1985 with a score of 42.16. Their score was 39.83 in 1992, but they had fallen to number 12. The number one school in 1992 was the University of Arizona with a score of 105.70! Not only does this validate a restructuring of the rankings, it also shows a significant increase in overall research productivity in the MIS field.

The *per capita* factor was used to prevent smaller institutions from ranking low due to smaller departmental size. This resulted in inflated scores in some cases. The number one school, *per capita* in 1992, was Rice University. Looking at the results without the *per capita* factor show Rice University dropping to number 20. This validates Niemi's (1988b) assertion that *per capita* indicators are extremely sensitive to the work of a few individuals in smaller institutions.

The majority of institutions in the top ten of the *per capita* rankings remained in the top ten non-*per capita* rankings. They normally differed in specific positions held. The least number of schools remaining in the top ten was four in 1989. The most schools remaining in the top ten were eight in 1990.

There were large changes in position for institutions with a large faculty between the two rankings. The most notable was the University of Minnesota. They changed in rank on the average of 27 places between the *per capita* and the non *per capita* results, with the a high of 38 places in 1988 and a low of 16 places in 1985. This was attributed to having the largest faculty size, resulting in low *per capita* scores.

Finally, Niemi stated that department sizes change over the years making calculation of *per capita* weights difficult. Since the *per capita* factors in this study were based on 1992 faculty size, the relevance of the *per capita* results is questionable beyond that year.

B. COMPARISON WITH GROVER, ET AL.

Only two schools out of the *per capita* top ten are listed in the results of Grover, et al., (1992). However, without the *per capita* score, the number jumps to five. It is interesting to note that the differences in position between the latter were fairly close. Overall, the differences can be attributed to differences in methodologies plus the difference in the time period for the summary report.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. RECOMMENDATIONS

Ranking studies of this nature should be published every five years to note where the primary research centers are. Annual results are important as well as cumulative results.

A comparison study using Niemi's (1988b) method of counting the number of published pages of research and scoring on the basis of number of articles published would be interesting.

The list of journals used was not all encompassing. They were not all IS specific either. Some of the journals that were highly rated in their prestige had few pertinent IS articles in them over the eight year period. Those journals may be deemed prestigious, but their weighting factor should be lower considering their pertinence to IS is low. Five of the eleven journals contained 28 or fewer articles with IS related authorship. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, for example, contained only one article with IS related authorship. Choosing a more comprehensive journal set with a higher number of IS related articles is an important recommendation for future studies.

Ranking results with and without a *per capita* factor are both important. They would provide a continuous comparison of the two methods and allow for interpretation of the results in a manner most useful to the reader.

Using the 1992 DIRECTORY OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACULTY guide will help with determining authorship and employing department correctly. Using the appropriate year guide would also be helpful in determining the *per capita* factor accurately.

A comparison of subjective and objective rankings would be useful in determining significant differences between the two measures.

B. CONCLUSION

Many rankings of academic departments have been done based on subjective measures. One popular form is an opinion survey. Although informative, subjective methods are affected by personal bias and may not capture a true assessment of quality. Development of methods to rank institutions is necessary for objective evaluations. Using research productivity as a measurement, methodologies were developed to produce an objective ranking of academic IS departments. The results of this study demonstrate that major changes are going on in the field of IS. This study provides an objective means of determining compensation and career tracking, justification for research grants, or indicators of the leading research centers. This is particularly pertinent to DoD. This method is a practical means of justification when competing for resources or during budget reviews. This technique could be employed by DoD in assessing research output of DoD sponsored laboratories and schools. This study has proven that applied, objective measures are available and useful to determine quality.

Appendix A-1. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1985-1992

	University	Total	Per Capita
1	Pennsylvania	272.93	54.59
2	Massachusetts	246.57	49.31
3	Ohio State	339.72	48.53
4	Arizona	506.84	42.24
5	SUNY-Albany	126.48	42.16
6	Queens	150.55	37.64
7	CMU	188.24	36.23
8	Georgia	209.96	34.99
9	Toledo	173.60	34.72
10	Rice	31.80	31.80
11	Penn State	106.94	29.16
12	Syracuse	85.98	28.66
13	Houston	218.70	27.34
14	UCLA	156.95	26.16
15	Rochester	12.57	25.14
16	SMU	96.67	24.17
17	Drexel	67.51	22.50
18	Colorado	101.28	20.26
19	UNC-Charlotte	39.22	19.61
20	Hawaii	94.81	18.96
21	Texas-Austin	262.36	18.74
22	UC-Irvine	163.48	18.16
23	Laval	71.20	17.80
24	Texas Tech	121.96	17.07
26	Colorado-Denver	100.20	16.70
27	Dayton	125.46	15.68
28	Minnesota	403.49	15.52
29	Rhode Island	29.16	14.58
30	Temple	43.28	14.13
32	MIT	161.90	13.49
33	British Columbia	94.18	13.45
34	McGill	40.04	13.35
35	Florida	104.64	13.08
36	Bowling Green St	64.37	12.89
37	NYU	240.34	12.65
38	Illinois-Urbana	37.71	12.57
39	McMaster	49.23	12.31
40	UNC-Greensboro	72.89	12.15
41	Florida Intl	127.75	11.61
42	Case Western	91.64	11.46
43	FSU	89.22	11.15
44	Pace University	11.09	11.09
45	Georgia Tech	66.33	11.06
46	USC	94.94	10.55
47	Missouri-St Louis	94.55	10.51
48	Loyola Marymount	10.01	10.01
48	Bryant College	10.01	10.01
50	Georgia St	148.62	9.91
51	Rutgers	39.58	9.90
52	Cincinnati	55.55	9.26

53	Notre Dame	9.14	9.14
54	Arkansas	54.52	9.09
55	Florida Atlantic	63.44	9.06
56	Cal St-San Marcos	8.98	8.75
58	Boston	67.80	8.47
59	Michigan	84.10	8.41
60	South Carolina	17.96	7.71
61	TCU	29.21	7.30
62	Denver	29.00	7.25
63	Illinois Inst of Tech	21.71	7.24
64	Baltimore	59.14	6.57
65	Rensselaer	32.59	6.52
66	Naval PGS	110.19	6.48
67	Arizona St	57.95	6.45
68	Cornell	18.99	6.33
69	Colorado-Colo Spgs	37.87	6.31
70	Vanderbilt	12.57	6.29
70	Dalhousie	12.57	6.29
72	George Mason	49.44	6.18
73	Cal State	29.16	5.59
75	Nevada-Reno	11.09	5.55
75	SW Texas St	33.27	5.55
75	Maine	11.09	5.55
78	Purdue	32.80	5.47
79	Iowa St	29.64	5.39
80	Quebec	31.11	5.19
81	San Diego St	50.92	5.09
82	BYU	60.88	5.07
83	Toronto	10.01	5.01
83	Cal St-Fullerton	10.01	5.01
85	Oakland University	49.23	4.92
86	Texas-Arlington	38.51	4.81
87	Detroit	9.14	4.57
87	Vermont	9.14	4.57
87	St Joseph's	9.14	4.57
90	Texas A&M	45.22	4.52
91	Luther College	8.98	4.49
92	Delaware	43.28	4.33
93	Auburn	37.98	4.22
94	Ill-Chicago	37.71	4.19
94	LaSalle	12.57	4.19
96	American University	41.12	4.11
97	Indiana	40.47	4.05
98	Kent St	22.18	3.70
98	SUNY-Buffalo	22.18	3.70
100	Babson College	30.08	3.34
100	Columbus College	10.01	3.34
102	Northwestern	9.90	3.30
103	Wisconsin-Milwaukee	29.16	3.24
103	SW Missouri St	45.38	3.24
105	Calgary	36.95	3.08

Appendix A-1. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1985-1992

106	Wisconsin-Madison	9.14	3.05
106	Western Kentucky	18.28	3.05
108	Western Carolina	8.98	2.99
108	Cal Poly St	8.98	2.99
108	Western Michigan	8.98	2.99
111	Boise St	29.00	2.90
112	SUNY-Binghamton	11.09	2.77
112	Cal St-Dom Hills	11.09	2.77
114	James Madison	21.71	2.71
115	Kentucky	18.28	2.61
116	Mississippi St	12.57	2.51
116	Cal St-Long Beach	12.57	2.51
116	Va Tech	12.57	2.51
119	Western Ontario	10.01	2.50
119	Waterloo	10.01	2.50
121	Miami (FL)	42.25	2.49
122	UTEP	19.15	2.39
123	Old Dominion	9.14	2.29
124	Canisius College	8.98	2.25
124	North Texas State	29.21	2.25
126	UC-Berkeley	11.09	2.22
127	Pittsburgh	19.15	2.13
128	Connecticut	12.57	2.10
129	Appalachian St	18.28	2.04
130	George Washington	11.09	1.85
131	LSU	8.98	1.80
131	Hartford	8.98	1.80
131	Eastern Illinois	8.98	1.80
134	Bentley College	27.97	1.75
135	Kansas St	11.09	1.58
136	Tennessee Tech	9.14	1.52
137	Md-Baltimore	11.09	1.39
137	Loyola College	11.09	1.39
139	St Cloud St	20.23	1.35
140	Oklahoma St	9.14	1.31
140	Central Conn St	9.14	1.31
142	Wisconsin-Whitewater	8.98	1.28
143	Northeastern	10.01	1.25
144	Colorado St	11.09	1.23
145	Eastern Michigan	9.14	1.14
146	Washington	8.98	1.12
146	Ball St	8.98	1.12
148	South Florida	18.99	1.06
149	Southern Ill-Ed	9.14	1.02
150	Depaul	10.01	0.91
151	Miami (Ohio)	11.09	0.85
152	North Texas	8.98	0.69
153	Middle Tennessee St	10.01	0.67
154	South Florida	10.01	0.56

Appendix A-2. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1992

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	Rice	1	20.71	1	1.00	20.71
2	Drexel	3	48.52	5	0.33	16.17
3	Penn State	3.67	59.29	7	0.27	16.17
4	Georgia	6	65.88	7	0.17	10.98
5	Bryant College	1	10.01	1	1.00	10.01
6	Arizona	12	105.70	11	0.08	8.81
7	Pennsylvania	5	36.95	4	0.20	7.39
8	CMU	6	40.25	4	0.17	6.71
9	Florida Intl	11	72.58	7	0.09	6.60
10	Memphis St	8	51.74	5	0.13	6.47
11	Toledo	5	31.56	3	0.20	6.31
12	FSU	8	49.23	5	0.13	6.15
13	Syracuse	3	18.12	2	0.33	6.04
14	Dayton	8	47.49	5	0.13	5.94
15	UNCC	2	11.09	1	0.50	5.55
16	Iowa St	5	26.94	3	0.20	5.39
17	Queens	4	20.02	2	0.25	5.01
18	Boston	8	39.83	5	0.13	4.98
19	St Joseph's	2	9.14	1	0.50	4.57
20	South Carolina	2.33	8.98	1	0.43	3.85
21	Md-College Park	5	18.99	2	0.20	3.80
22	Kent St	6	22.18	2	0.17	3.70
22	Temple	3	11.09	1	0.33	3.70
22	Georgia Tech	6	22.18	2	0.17	3.70
25	Houston	8	29.16	3	0.13	3.65
26	Arizona St	9	30.69	3	0.11	3.41
27	Columbus College	3	10.01	1	0.33	3.34
27	McGill	3	10.01	1	0.33	3.34
29	Ohio State	7	22.18	2	0.14	3.17
30	Rochester	4	12.57	1	0.25	3.14
31	UCLA	6	18.20	2	0.17	3.03
32	Western Carolina	3	8.98	1	0.33	2.99
33	British Columbia	7	18.99	2	0.14	2.71
34	Minnesota	26	62.62	6	0.04	2.41
35	Texas-Austin	14	32.80	4	0.07	2.34
36	TCU	4	9.14	1	0.25	2.29
37	Auburn	9	20.02	2	0.11	2.22
37	Delaware	10	22.18	1	0.10	2.22
37	Colorado	5	11.09	1	0.20	2.22
40	NYU	19	39.83	4	0.05	2.10
41	Oakland	10	20.07	2	0.10	2.01
41	Georgia St	15	30.08	3	0.07	2.01
43	Indiana	10	18.76	1	0.10	1.88
44	George Wash	6	11.09	1	0.17	1.85
45	Massachusetts	5	9.14	1	0.20	1.83
45	Bowling Green St	5	9.14	1	0.20	1.83
47	Texas A&M	10	18.12	2	0.10	1.81
48	MIT	12	19.63	1	0.08	1.64
49	BYU	12	18.28	2	0.08	1.52
49	Western Kentucky	6	9.14	1	0.17	1.52

49	Tennessee Tech	6	9.14	1	0.17	1.52
49	Purdue	6	9.14	1	0.17	1.52
53	Calgary	12	17.96	2	0.08	1.50
54	Harvard	7	9.90	1	0.14	1.41
55	USC	9	12.57	1	0.11	1.40
56	Kentucky	7	9.14	1	0.14	1.31
56	Central Conn St	7	9.14	1	0.14	1.31
56	Texas Tech	7	9.14	1	0.14	1.31
56	Oklahoma St	7	9.14	1	0.14	1.31
60	Wisconsin-Wtwtr	7	8.98	1	0.14	1.28
60	Florida Atlantic	7	8.98	1	0.14	1.28
62	Northeastern	8	10.01	1	0.13	1.25
63	Babson College	9	11.09	1	0.11	1.23
64	UC-Irvine	9	10.10	1	0.11	1.12
65	San Diego St5	10	11.09	1	0.10	1.11
66	Pittsburgh	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
67	Depaul	11	10.01	1	0.09	0.91
68	North Texas	13	8.98	1	0.08	0.69
69	Middle Tenn St	15	10.01	1	0.07	0.67
70	St Cloud St	15	9.14	1	0.07	0.61
71	South Florida	18	10.01	1	0.06	0.56
72	Naval PGS	17	8.98	1	0.06	0.53

Appendix A-3. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1991

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	Arizona	12	158.06	15	0.08	13.17
2	Loyola Marymount	1	10.01	1	1.00	10.01
3	UNC-Charlotte	2	19.15	2	0.50	9.57
4	Texas-Austin	14	94.81	7	0.07	6.77
5	Massachusetts	5	32.77	3	0.20	6.55
6	Drexel	3	18.99	2	0.33	6.33
7	Vanderbilt	2	12.57	1	0.50	6.28
8	Pennsylvania	5	30.08	3	0.20	6.02
9	Toledo	5	27.42	3	0.20	5.48
10	Georgia	6	31.72	3	0.17	5.29
11	SMU	4	21.1	2	0.25	5.27
12	Ohio State	7	36.23	3	0.14	5.18
13	Denver	4	20.02	2	0.25	5.01
14	Penn State	3.67	18.28	2	0.27	4.98
15	UC-Irvine	9	44.36	4	0.11	4.93
16	Rutgers	4	19.56	2	0.25	4.89
17	Colorado-Denver	6	29.00	3	0.17	4.83
18	South Carolina	2.33	8.98	1	0.43	3.85
19	UCLA	6	22.58	2	0.17	3.76
20	Dayton	8	27.42	3	0.13	3.43
20	FSU	8	27.42	3	0.13	3.43
22	McGill	3	10.01	1	0.33	3.34
23	Syracuse	3	9.97	1	0.33	3.32
24	CMU	6	19.63	2	0.17	3.27
25	Minnesota	26	84.22	8	0.04	3.24
26	British Columbia	7	22.58	2	0.14	3.23
27	Houston	8	25.14	2	0.13	3.14
27	Rochester	4	12.57	1	0.25	3.05
29	Illinois Tech	3	9.14	1	0.33	3.05
29	Arkansas	6	18.28	2	0.17	3.05
31	Cal Poly St	3	8.98	1	0.33	2.99
32	Michigan	10	29.37	3	0.10	2.94
33	Queens	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
34	Va Tech	5	12.57	1	0.20	2.51
35	Western Ontario	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
35	Laval	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
37	George Mason	8	18.28	2	0.13	2.29
38	Case Western	8	18.12	2	0.13	2.27
39	Connecticut	6	12.57	1	0.17	2.10
40	Hawaii	5	10.01	1	0.20	2.00
40	Colorado	5	10.01	1	0.20	2.00
42	SW Missouri St	14	27.42	3	0.07	1.96
43	Georgia Tech	6	11.09	1	0.17	1.85
44	California St	5.08	9.14	1	0.20	1.80
45	Bowling Green St	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
45	Md-College Park	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
47	Quebec	6	10.01	1	0.17	1.67
48	Western Kentucky	6	9.14	1	0.17	1.52
49	Colorado-ColSpgs	6	8.98	1	0.17	1.50
50	Florida Atlantic	7	10.10	1	0.14	1.44

Appendix A-3. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1991

51	Ill-Chicago	9	12.57	1	0.11	1.40
52	Md-Baltimore	8	11.09	1	0.13	1.39
53	Kentucky	7	9.14	1	0.14	1.31
54	Indiana	10	12.57	1	0.10	1.26
55	Florida Intl	11	12.57	1	0.09	1.14
56	UTEP	8	9.14	1	0.13	1.14
56	Florida	8	9.14	1	0.13	1.14
58	Boston	8	8.98	1	0.13	1.12
58	Bentley College	16	17.96	2	0.06	1.12
60	Missouri-St Louis	9	10.01	1	0.11	1.11
61	MIT	12	12.57	1	0.08	1.05
62	Appalachian ST	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
63	USC	9	8.98	1	0.11	1.00
63	Babson College	9	8.98	1	0.11	1.00
65	Oakland	10	9.14	1	0.10	0.91
66	Georgia St	15	10.01	1	0.07	0.67
67	Naval PGS	17	8.98	1	0.06	0.53
68	Miami (FL)	17	8.98	1	0.06	0.53
69	South Florida	18	8.98	1	0.06	0.50

Appendix A-4. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1990

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	Pennsylvania	5	73.84	7	0.20	14.77
2	SUNY-Albany	3	38.30	4	0.33	12.77
3	Arizona	12	117.95	12	0.08	9.83
4	Cal St-San Marc	1	8.98	1	1.00	8.98
5	Stanford	4	34.33	3	0.25	8.58
6	Massachusetts	5	41.00	4	0.20	8.20
7	SMU	4	29.00	3	0.25	7.25
8	Houston	8	56.47	5	0.13	7.06
9	Ohio State	7	43.47	4	0.14	6.21
10	UCLA	6	33.27	3	0.17	5.55
11	Rhode Island	2	9.14	1	0.50	4.57
12	Ill-Urbana	3	12.57	1	0.33	4.19
12	LaSalle	3	12.57	1	0.33	4.19
14	SUNY-Buffalo	6	22.18	2	0.17	3.70
15	Florida	8	27.26	3	0.13	3.41
16	Northwestern	3	9.90	1	0.33	3.30
17	Syracuse	3	8.98	1	0.33	2.99
17	Arkansas	6	17.96	2	0.17	2.99
19	Texas Tech	7	20.02	2	0.14	2.86
20	Queens	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
20	McMaster	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
22	Dayton	8	21.55	2	0.13	2.69
23	MIT	12	30.53	3	0.08	2.54
24	Cal St-Long Beach	5	12.57	1	0.20	2.51
25	Laval	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
26	Penn State	3.67	9.14	1	0.27	2.49
27	UC-Irvine	9	22.18	2	0.11	2.46
28	Rutgers	4	9.14	1	0.25	2.29
29	Denver	4	8.98	1	0.25	2.25
30	Baltimore	9	19.15	2	0.11	2.13
31	Georgia Tech	6	11.09	1	0.17	1.85
32	Toledo	5	9.14	1	0.20	1.83
33	Hartford	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
33	LSU	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
33	Colorado	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
33	Eastern Illinois	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
37	Colorado-Denver	6	10.01	1	0.17	1.67
38	Minnesota	26	41.57	4	0.04	1.60
39	FSU	8	12.57	1	0.13	1.57
40	UNC-Greensboro	6	8.98	1	0.17	1.50
41	Harvard	7	9.90	1	0.14	1.41
42	Loyola College	8	11.09	1	0.13	1.39
43	Texas-Austin	14	18.60	2	0.07	1.33
44	SW Missouri St	14	17.96	2	0.07	1.28
45	Michigan	10	12.57	1	0.10	1.26
46	George Mason	8	8.98	1	0.13	1.12
46	Washington	8	8.98	1	0.13	1.12
48	Wisconsin-Milw	9	10.01	1	0.11	1.11
49	Appalachian ST	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
49	Southern Ill-Ed	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02

Appendix A-4. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1990

49	Missouri-St Louis	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
52	Oakland	10	10.01	1	0.10	1.00
52	Arizona St	9	8.98	1	0.11	1.00
54	San Diego St	10	8.98	1	0.10	0.90
54	Texas A&M	10	8.98	1	0.10	0.90
54	Boise St	10	8.98	1	0.10	0.90
57	Miami (Ohio)	13	11.09	1	0.08	0.85
58	Georgia St	15	11.09	1	0.07	0.74
59	North Texas St	13	8.98	1	0.08	0.69
60	Miami (FL)	17	11.09	1	0.06	0.65
61	Naval PGS	17	8.98	1	0.06	0.53

Appendix A-5. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1989

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	CMU	6	89.10	9	0.17	14.85
2	Rice	1	11.09	1	1.00	11.09
3	Syracuse	3	30.95	3	0.33	10.32
4	Colorado	5	51.18	5	0.20	10.24
5	SUNY-Albany	3	22.18	2	0.33	7.39
6	Massachusetts	5	34.54	3	0.20	6.91
7	Toledo	5	34.28	4	0.20	6.86
8	Georgia	6	36.24	4	0.17	6.04
9	Nevada-Reno	2	11.09	1	0.50	5.55
9	Maine	2	11.09	1	0.50	5.55
11	UNC-Greensboro	6	32.19	3	0.17	5.36
12	Laval	4	20.07	2	0.25	5.02
13	Toronto	2	10.01	1	0.50	5.01
13	Cal St-Fullerton	2	10.01	1	0.50	5.01
15	Arizona	12	56.15	6	0.08	4.68
16	Florida	8	36.56	4	0.13	4.57
17	Ohio State	7	31.08	3	0.14	4.44
18	Texas Tech	7	27.97	3	0.14	4.00
19	Texas-Arlington	8	27.42	3	0.13	3.43
20	McGill	3	10.01	1	0.33	3.34
21	NYU	19	62.36	6	0.05	3.28
22	San Diego St	10	30.85	3	0.10	3.09
23	Baltimore	9	27.42	3	0.11	3.05
24	Cornell	3	8.98	1	0.33	2.99
25	Florida Intl	11	32.59	3	0.09	2.96
26	Houston	8	23.66	2	0.13	2.96
27	Georgia St	15	44.15	4	0.07	2.94
28	SUNY-Binghamton	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
28	George Mason	8	22.18	2	0.13	2.77
30	MIT	12	31.11	3	0.08	2.59
31	Mississippi St	5	12.57	1	0.20	2.51
32	BYU	12	30.03	3	0.08	2.50
33	Naval PGS	17	40.96	4	0.06	2.41
34	Minnesota	26	62.27	6	0.04	2.40
35	SMU	4	9.14	1	0.25	2.29
36	TCU	4	8.98	1	0.25	2.25
36	McMaster	4	8.98	1	0.25	2.25
38	Texas-Austin	14	30.69	3	0.07	2.19
39	Missouri-St Louis	9	18.99	2	0.11	2.11
40	Boise St	10	20.02	2	0.10	2.00
40	Hawaii	5	10.01	1	0.20	2.00
42	Quebec	6	11.09	1	0.17	1.85
43	Georgia Tech	6	10.88	1	0.17	1.81
44	Bowling Green St	5	8.98	1	0.20	1.80
45	Kansas St	7	11.09	1	0.14	1.58
45	Florida Atlantic	7	11.09	1	0.14	1.58
47	Cincinnati	6	8.98	1	0.17	1.50
48	Colorado St	9	11.09	1	0.11	1.23
49	James Madison	8	9.14	1	0.13	1.14
49	Case Western	8	9.14	1	0.13	1.14

Appendix A-5. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1989

51	Boston	8	8.98	1	0.13	1.12
51	Ball St	8	8.98	1	0.13	1.12
53	Wisconsin-Milw	9	10.01	1	0.11	1.11
53	Babson College	9	10.01	1	0.11	1.11
53	Delaware	10	11.09	1	0.10	1.11
56	Michigan	10	10.01	1	0.10	1.00
56	USC	9	8.98	1	0.11	1.00
58	Indiana	10	9.14	1	0.10	0.91
59	South Florida	18	10.01	1	0.06	0.56

Appendix A-6. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1988

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	Pennsylvania	5	61.59	6	0.20	12.32
2	Colorado-Denver	6	61.19	6	0.17	10.20
3	Rhode Island	2	20.02	2	0.50	10.01
4	Queens	4	32.19	3	0.25	8.05
5	Texas Tech	7	54.82	5	0.14	7.83
6	Temple	3	21.10	2	0.33	7.03
7	Massachusetts	5	31.86	3	0.20	6.37
8	Georgia	6	38.14	4	0.17	6.36
9	Ohio State	7	44.30	4	0.14	6.33
10	USC	9	54.40	5	0.11	6.04
11	Toledo	5	29.00	3	0.20	5.80
12	Harvard	7	39.93	4	0.14	5.70
13	Bowling Green St	5	28.13	3	0.20	5.63
14	McMaster	4	19.15	2	0.25	4.79
15	Detroit	2	9.14	1	0.50	4.57
16	Houston	8	36.23	3	0.13	4.53
17	Luther College	2	8.98	1	0.50	4.49
18	Hawaii	5	22.18	2	0.20	4.44
19	Ill-Urbana	3	12.57	1	0.33	4.19
19	Illinois	3	12.57	1	0.33	4.19
21	Purdue	6	23.66	2	0.17	3.94
22	CMU	6	22.18	2	0.17	3.70
23	Texas-Austin	14	51.18	5	0.07	3.66
24	UNC-Greensboro	6	21.71	2	0.17	3.62
25	UCLA	6	21.55	2	0.17	3.59
26	McGill	3	10.01	1	0.33	3.34
27	Arizona	12	39.01	4	0.08	3.25
28	Cincinnati	6	19.15	2	0.17	3.19
29	Arkansas	6	18.28	2	0.17	3.05
30	Penn State	3.67	11.09	1	0.27	3.02
31	Western Michigan	3	8.98	1	0.33	2.99
32	Cal St-Dom Hills	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
32	Laval	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
34	Rutgers	4	10.88	1	0.25	2.72
35	UC-Irvine	9	22.54	2	0.11	2.50
36	MIT	12	29.92	3	0.08	2.49
37	Dayton	8	18.99	2	0.13	2.37
38	SMU	4	9.14	1	0.25	2.29
38	Memphis St	8	18.28	2	0.13	2.29
40	Canisius College	4	8.98	1	0.25	2.25
41	American U	10	21.10	2	0.10	2.11
42	Colorado	5	10.01	1	0.20	2.00
42	Rensselaer	5	10.01	1	0.20	2.00
43	Minnesota	26	49.02	5	0.04	1.89
44	Georgia St	15	21.10	2	0.07	1.41
45	Baltimore	9	12.57	1	0.11	1.40
46	Texas-Arlington	8	11.09	1	0.13	1.39
47	Case Western	8	10.01	1	0.13	1.25
48	Naval PGS	17	21.10	2	0.06	1.24
49	NYU	19	22.58	2	0.05	1.19

Appendix A-6. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1988

50	Pittsburgh	9	10.01	1	0.11	1.11
50	Michigan	10	11.09	1	0.10	1.11
52	BYU	12	12.57	1	0.08	1.05
53	Missouri-St Louis	9	8.98	1	0.11	1.00
54	Texas A&M	10	8.98	1	0.10	0.90
55	North Texas St	13	11.09	1	0.08	0.85
56	St Cloud St	15	11.09	1	0.07	0.74

Appendix A-7. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1987

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	Ohio State	7	117.04	11	0.14	16.72
2	Massachusetts	5	64.41	6	0.20	12.88
3	SUNY-Albany	3	30.85	3	0.33	10.28
4	Pennsylvania	5	50.60	5	0.20	10.12
5	Queens	4	34.33	3	0.25	8.58
6	Toledo	5	42.20	4	0.20	8.44
7	Hawaii	5	32.59	3	0.20	6.52
8	Georgia	6	37.98	4	0.17	6.33
9	Syracuse	3	17.96	2	0.33	5.99
10	SMU	4	19.15	2	0.25	4.79
11	Houston	8	36.95	4	0.13	4.62
12	Vermont	2	9.14	1	0.50	4.57
13	UNC-Charlotte	2	8.98	1	0.50	4.49
14	Harvard	7	29.92	3	0.14	4.27
15	Ill-Urbana	3	12.57	1	0.33	4.19
16	Cal State	5.08	20.02	2	0.20	3.94
17	UC-Irvine	9	32.15	3	0.11	3.57
18	Cornell	3	10.01	1	0.33	3.34
19	UCLA	6	19.15	2	0.17	3.19
20	Wisconsin-Mad	3	9.14	1	0.33	3.05
21	British Columbia	7	20.02	2	0.14	2.86
22	Florida	8	21.71	2	0.13	2.71
23	Laval	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
24	Colorado	5	10.01	1	0.20	2.00
25	Auburn	9	17.96	2	0.11	2.00
26	CMU	6	11.09	1	0.17	1.85
27	Bowling Green St	5	9.14	1	0.20	1.83
28	Minnesota	26	41.57	4	0.04	1.60
29	Texas-Austin	14	21.71	2	0.07	1.55
30	NYU	19	29.05	3	0.05	1.53
31	MIT	12	18.12	2	0.08	1.51
32	Colorado-ColSpgs	6	8.98	1	0.17	1.50
33	Georgia St	15	22.18	2	0.07	1.48
34	Ill-Chicago	9	12.57	1	0.11	1.40
35	UTEP	8	10.01	1	0.13	1.25
36	Eastern Michigan	8	9.14	1	0.13	1.14
37	Arizona St	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
37	Missouri-St Louis	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
39	Delaware	10	10.01	1	0.10	1.00
39	American U	10	10.01	1	0.10	1.00
41	Texas A&M	10	9.14	1	0.10	0.91
42	Arizona	12	8.98	1	0.08	0.75
42	Calgary	12	8.98	1	0.08	0.75
44	North Texas St	13	9.14	1	0.08	0.70
45	Bentley College	16	10.01	1	0.06	0.63

Appendix A-8. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1986

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	Notre Dame	1	9.14	1	1.00	9.14
2	Dalhousie	2	12.57	1	0.50	6.28
3	CMU	6	35.15	3	0.17	5.86
4	SW Texas St	6	33.27	3	0.17	5.55
5	UCLA	6	32.19	3	0.17	5.36
6	Florida Atlantic	7	33.27	3	0.14	4.75
7	Rensselaer	5	22.58	2	0.20	4.52
8	Hawaii	5	20.02	2	0.20	4.00
9	Colorado-ColSpgs	6	19.91	2	0.17	3.32
10	Ohio State	7	21.97	2	0.14	3.14
11	British Columbia	7	20.02	2	0.14	2.86
12	Harvard	7	19.91	2	0.14	2.84
13	TCU	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
13	Stanford	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
15	Case Western	8	21.10	2	0.13	2.64
16	Queens	4	10.10	1	0.25	2.53
17	Waterloo	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
17	Laval	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
17	McMaster	4	10.01	1	0.25	2.50
20	Penn State	3.67	9.14	1	0.27	2.49
21	NYU	19	44.36	4	0.05	2.33
22	Pennsylvania	5	9.90	1	0.20	1.98
23	Georgia Tech	6	11.09	1	0.17	1.85
24	UNC-Greensboro	6	10.01	1	0.17	1.67
25	Minnesota	26	42.20	4	0.04	1.62
26	Cincinnati	6	9.14	1	0.17	1.52
27	Ill-Chicago	9	12.57	1	0.11	1.40
28	Houston	8	11.09	1	0.13	1.39
29	Miami (FL)	17	22.18	2	0.06	1.30
30	Dayton	8	10.01	1	0.13	1.25
30	Naval PGS	17	21.19	2	0.06	1.25
30	Florida	8	9.97	1	0.13	1.25
33	USC	9	10.01	1	0.11	1.11
34	Arizona St	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
34	Missouri-St Louis	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
34	Wisconsin-Milw	9	9.14	1	0.11	1.02
37	Oakland	10	10.01	1	0.10	1.00
37	American U	10	10.01	1	0.10	1.00
37	Michigan	10	9.97	1	0.10	1.00
40	Arizona	12	11.09	1	0.08	0.92
41	Florida Intl	11	10.01	1	0.09	0.91
42	Texas-Austin	14	12.57	1	0.07	0.90
43	MIT	12	10.01	1	0.08	0.83

Appendix A-9. Per Capita Academic Departmental Rankings-1985

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art	Per Capita	TOTAL
1	SUNY-Albany	3	35.15	3	0.33	11.72
2	Pace University	1	11.09	1	1.00	11.09
3	Queens	4	31.73	3	0.25	7.93
4	Massachusetts	5	32.85	3	0.20	6.57
5	Case Western	8	33.27	3	0.13	4.16
6	Temple	3	11.09	1	0.33	3.70
7	UC-Irvine	9	32.15	3	0.11	3.57
8	Ohio State	7	23.45	2	0.14	3.35
9	Missouri-St Louis	9	29.15	3	0.11	3.24
10	Stanford	4	11.09	1	0.25	2.77
11	Old Dominion	4	9.14	1	0.25	2.29
11	SMU	4	9.14	1	0.25	2.29
13	NYU	19	42.16	4	0.05	2.22
14	UC-Berkeley	5	11.09	1	0.20	2.22
15	Pennsylvania	5	9.97	1	0.20	1.99
16	British Columbia	7	12.57	1	0.14	1.80
17	Quebec	6	10.01	1	0.17	1.67
17	UCLA	6	10.01	1	0.17	1.67
18	James Madison	8	12.57	1	0.13	1.57
19	Texas Tech	7	10.01	1	0.14	1.43
20	Harvard	7	9.90	1	0.14	1.41
21	Boston	8	10.01	1	0.13	1.25
22	Michigan	10	11.09	1	0.10	1.11
23	MIT	12	10.01	1	0.08	0.83
23	Calgary	12	10.01	1	0.08	0.83
25	Arizona	12	9.90	1	0.08	0.83
26	Minnesota	26	20.02	2	0.04	0.77
27	Georgia St	15	10.01	1	0.07	0.67

Appendix B-1. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1985-1992

	University	Total	Per Capita
1	Arizona	506.84	42.24
2	Minnesota	403.49	15.52
3	Ohio State	339.72	48.53
4	Pennsylvania	272.93	54.59
5	Texas-Austin	262.36	18.74
6	Massachusetts	246.57	49.31
7	NYU	240.34	12.65
8	Houston	218.70	27.34
9	Georgia	209.96	34.99
10	CMU	188.24	36.23
11	Toledo	173.60	34.72
12	UC-Irvine	163.48	18.16
13	MIT	161.90	13.49
14	UCLA	156.95	26.16
15	Queens	150.55	37.64
16	Georgia St	148.62	9.91
17	Florida Intl	127.75	11.61
18	SUNY-Albany	126.48	42.16
19	Dayton	125.46	15.68
20	Texas Tech	121.96	17.42
21	Harvard	119.46	17.07
22	Naval PGS	110.19	6.48
23	Penn State	106.94	29.16
24	Florida	104.64	13.08
25	Colorado	101.28	20.26
26	Colorado-Denver	100.20	16.70
27	SMU	96.67	24.17
28	USC	94.94	10.55
29	Hawaii	94.81	18.96
30	Missouri-St Louis	94.55	10.51
31	British Columbia	94.18	13.45
32	Case Western	91.64	11.46
33	FSU	89.22	11.15
34	Syracuse	85.98	8.41
36	UNC-Greensboro	72.89	12.15
37	Laval	71.20	17.80
38	Memphis St	70.02	8.75
39	Boston	67.80	8.47
40	Drexel	67.51	22.50
41	Georgia Tech	66.33	11.06
42	Bowling Green St	64.37	12.89
43	Florida Atlantic	63.44	9.06
44	BYU	60.88	5.07
45	Baltimore	59.14	6.57
46	Arizona St	57.95	6.45
47	Stanford	56.51	14.13
48	Cincinnati	55.55	9.26
49	Arkansas	54.52	9.09
50	San Diego St	50.92	5.09
51	George Mason	49.44	6.18

Appendix B-1. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1985-1992

52	McMaster	49.23	12.31
52	Oakland University	49.23	4.92
54	SW Missouri St	45.38	3.24
55	Texas A&M	45.22	4.52
56	Delaware	43.28	4.33
56	Temple	43.28	14.43
58	Miami (FL)	42.25	2.49
59	American University	41.12	4.05
61	McGill	40.04	13.35
62	Rutgers	39.58	9.90
63	UNC-Charlotte	39.22	19.61
64	Texas-Arlington	38.51	4.22
66	Colorado-Colo Spgs	37.87	6.31
67	Ill-Urbana	37.71	12.57
67	Ill-Chicago	37.71	4.19
69	Calgary	36.95	3.08
70	SW Texas St	33.27	5.55
71	Purdue	32.80	5.47
72	Rensselaer	32.59	6.52
73	Rice	31.80	31.80
74	Quebec	31.11	5.19
75	Babson College	30.08	3.34
76	Iowa St	29.64	5.39
77	North Texas State	29.21	2.25
77	TCU	29.21	7.30
79	Cal State	29.16	5.74
79	Rhode Island	29.16	14.58
79	Wisconsin-Milwaukee	29.16	3.24
82	Denver	29.00	7.25
82	Boise St	29.00	2.90
84	Md-College Park	27.97	5.59
84	Bentley College	27.97	1.75
86	Kent St	22.18	3.70
86	SUNY-Buffalo	22.18	3.70
88	James Madison	21.71	2.71
88	Illinois Inst of Tech	21.71	7.24
90	St Cloud St	20.23	1.35
91	UTEP	19.15	2.39
91	Pittsburgh	19.15	2.13
93	Cornell	18.99	6.33
93	South Florida	18.99	1.06
95	Kentucky	18.28	2.61
95	Western Kentucky	18.28	3.05
95	Appalachian St	18.28	2.04
98	South Carolina	17.96	7.71
99	Cal St-Long Beach	12.57	2.51
99	Rochester	12.57	25.14
99	Mississippi St	12.57	2.51
99	Va Tech	12.57	2.51
99	Connecticut	12.57	2.10
99	Vanderbilt	12.57	6.29

Appendix B-1. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1985-1992

99	Dalhousie	12.57	6.29
99	LaSalle	12.57	4.19
107	Kansas St	11.09	1.58
107	Miami (Ohio)	11.09	0.85
107	George Washington	11.09	1.85
107	Colorado St	11.09	1.23
107	Md-Baltimore	11.09	1.39
107	Loyola College	11.09	1.39
107	UC-Berkeley	11.09	2.22
107	Maine	11.09	5.55
107	SUNY-Binghamton	11.09	2.77
107	Nevada-Reno	11.09	5.55
107	Pace University	11.09	11.09
107	Cal St-Dom Hills	11.09	2.77
119	Northeastern	10.01	1.25
119	Depaul	10.01	0.91
119	Bryant College	10.01	10.01
119	Loyola Marymount	10.01	10.01
119	Middle Tennessee St	10.01	0.67
119	Toronto	10.01	5.01
119	Cal St-Fullerton	10.01	5.01
119	Columbus College	10.01	3.34
119	Waterloo	10.01	2.50
119	Western Ontario	10.01	2.50
119	South Florida	10.01	0.56
130	Northwestern	9.90	3.30
131	Central Conn St	9.14	1.31
131	Notre Dame	9.14	9.14
131	Wisconsin-Madison	9.14	3.05
131	Eastern Michigan	9.14	1.14
131	Southern Ill-Ed	9.14	1.02
131	St Joseph's	9.14	4.57
131	Oklahoma St	9.14	1.31
131	Tennessee Tech	9.14	1.52
131	Vermont	9.14	4.57
131	Detroit	9.14	4.57
131	Old Dominion	9.14	2.29
142	LSU	8.98	1.80
142	Washington	8.98	1.12
142	Western Michigan	8.98	2.99
142	North Texas	8.98	0.69
142	Cal Poly St	8.98	2.99
142	Cal St-San Marcos	8.98	8.98
142	Ball St	8.98	1.12
142	Hartford	8.98	1.80
142	Western Carolina	8.98	2.99
142	Eastern Illinois	8.98	1.80
142	Wisconsin-Whitewater	8.98	1.28
142	Canisius College	8.98	2.25
142	Luther College	8.98	4.49

Appendix B-2. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1992

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	Arizona	12	105.70	11
2	Florida Intl	11	72.58	7
3	Georgia	6	65.88	7
4	Minnesota	26	62.62	6
5	Penn State	3.67	59.29	7
6	Memphis St	8	51.74	5
7	FSU	8	49.23	5
8	Drexel	3	48.52	5
9	Dayton	8	47.49	5
10	CMU	6	40.25	4
11	Boston	8	39.83	5
11	NYU	19	39.83	4
13	Pennsylvania	5	36.95	4
14	Texas-Austin	14	32.80	4
15	Toledo	5	31.56	3
16	Arizona ST	9	30.69	3
17	Georgia St	15	30.08	3
18	Houston	8	29.16	3
19	Iowa St	5	26.94	3
20	Ohio State	7	22.18	2
20	Kent St	6	22.18	2
20	Delaware	10	22.18	1
20	Georgia Tech	6	22.18	2
24	Rice	1	20.71	1
25	Oakland	10	20.07	2
26	Queens	4	20.02	2
26	Auburn	9	20.02	2
28	MIT	12	19.63	1
29	Md-College Park	5	18.99	2
29	British Columbia	7	18.99	2
31	Indiana	10	18.76	1
32	BYU	12	18.28	2
33	UCLA	6	18.20	2
34	Texas A&M	10	18.12	2
34	Syracuse	3	18.12	2
36	Calgary	12	17.96	2
37	USC	9	12.57	1
37	Rochester	4	12.57	1
39	Babson College	9	11.09	1
39	George Washington	6	11.09	1
39	San Diego St	10	11.09	1
39	UNC-Charlotte	2	11.09	1
39	Colorado	5	11.09	1
39	Temple	3	11.09	1
45	UC-Irvine	9	10.10	1
46	McGill	3	10.01	1
46	Northeastern	8	10.01	1
46	Depaul	11	10.01	1
46	Middle Tenn St	15	10.01	1
46	Columbus College	3	10.01	1

Appendix B-2. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1992

46	South Florida	18	10.01	1
46	Bryant College	1	10.01	1
53	Harvard	7	9.90	1
54	Pittsburgh	9	9.14	1
54	St Cloud St	15	9.14	1
54	Oklahoma St	7	9.14	1
54	TCU	4	9.14	1
54	Texas Tech	7	9.14	1
54	Bowling Green St	5	9.14	1
54	Western Kentucky	6	9.14	1
54	St Joseph's	2	9.14	1
54	Massachusetts	5	9.14	1
54	Central Conn St	7	9.14	1
54	Tennessee Tech	6	9.14	1
54	Purdue	6	9.14	1
54	Kentucky	7	9.14	1
67	Wisconsin-Whtwtr	7	8.98	1
67	North Texas	13	8.98	1
67	Western Carolina	3	8.98	1
67	South Carolina	2.33	8.98	1
67	Florida Atlantic	7	8.98	1
67	Naval PGS	17	8.98	1

Appendix B-3. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1991

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	Arizona	12	158.06	15
2	Texas-Austin	14	94.81	7
3	Minnesota	26	84.22	8
4	UC-Irvine	9	44.36	4
5	Ohio State	7	36.23	3
6	Massachusetts	5	32.77	3
7	Georgia	6	31.72	3
8	Pennsylvania	5	30.08	3
9	Michigan	10	29.37	3
10	Colorado-Denver	6	29.00	3
11	Toledo	5	27.42	3
11	Dayton	8	27.42	3
11	FSU	8	27.42	3
11	SW Missouri St	14	27.42	3
15	Houston	8	25.14	2
16	UCLA	6	22.58	2
16	British Columbia	7	22.58	2
18	SMU	4	21.10	2
19	Denver	4	20.02	2
20	CMU	6	19.63	2
21	Rutgers	4	19.56	2
22	UNC-Charlotte	2	19.15	2
23	Drexel	3	18.99	2
24	Arkansas	6	18.28	2
24	Cincinnati	6	18.28	2
24	George Mason	8	18.28	2
24	Penn State	3.67	18.28	2
28	Case Western	8	18.12	2
29	Bentley College	16	17.96	2
30	Indiana	10	12.57	1
30	Ill-Chicago	9	12.57	1
30	Florida Intl	11	12.57	1
30	Connecticut	6	12.57	1
30	MIT	12	12.57	1
30	Va Tech	5	12.57	1
30	Rochester	4	12.57	1
30	Vanderbilt	2	12.57	1
38	Georgia Tech	6	11.09	1
38	Queens	4	11.09	1
38	Md-Baltimore	8	11.09	1
41	Florida Atlantic	7	10.10	1
42	Quebec	6	10.01	1
42	Laval	4	10.01	1
42	McGill	3	10.01	1
42	Georgia St	15	10.01	1
42	Missouri-St Louis	9	10.01	1
42	Western Ontario	4	10.01	1
42	Colorado	5	10.01	1
42	Hawaii	5	10.01	1
42	Loyola Marymount	1	10.01	1

Appendix B-3. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1991

51	Syracuse	3	9.97	1
52	Oakland	10	9.14	1
52	Western Kentucky	6	9.14	1
52	Florida	8	9.14	1
52	UTEP	8	9.14	1
52	Appalachian ST	9	9.14	1
52	Kentucky	7	9.14	1
52	Illinois Tech	3	9.14	1
52	California St	5.08	9.14	1
60	Boston	8	8.98	1
• 60	Naval PGS	17	8.98	1
60	Miami (FL)	17	8.98	1
60	Babson College	9	8.98	1
60	Md-College Park	5	8.98	1
60	USC	9	8.98	1
60	Cal Poly St	3	8.98	1
60	South Carolina	2.33	8.98	1
60	Bowling Green St	5	8.98	1
60	Colorado-ColSpgs	6	8.98	1
60	South Florida	18	8.98	1

Appendix B-4. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1990

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	Arizona	12	117.95	12
2	Pennsylvania	5	73.84	7
3	Houston	8	56.47	5
4	Ohio State	7	43.47	4
5	Minnesota	26	41.57	4
6	Massachusetts	5	41.00	4
7	SUNY-Albany	3	38.30	4
8	Stanford	4	34.33	3
9	UCLA	6	33.27	3
10	MIT	12	30.53	3
11	SMU	4	29.00	3
12	Florida	8	27.26	3
13	UC-Irvine	9	22.18	2
14	SUNY-Buffalo	6	22.18	2
15	Dayton	8	21.55	2
16	Texas Tech	7	20.02	2
17	Baltimore	9	19.15	2
18	Texas-Austin	14	18.60	2
19	SW Missouri St	14	17.96	2
19	Arkansas	6	17.96	2
21	Ill-Urbana	3	12.57	1
21	FSU	8	12.57	1
21	Cal St-Long Bch	5	12.57	1
21	Michigan	10	12.57	1
21	LaSalle	3	12.57	1
26	Georgia St	15	11.09	1
26	Loyola College	8	11.09	1
26	Miami(Ohio)	13	11.09	1
26	Miami (FL)	17	11.09	1
26	Georgia Tech	6	11.09	1
26	Queens	4	11.09	1
26	McMaster	4	11.09	1
33	Colorado-Denver	6	10.01	1
33	Oakland	10	10.01	1
33	Wisconsin-Milw	9	10.01	1
33	Laval	4	10.01	1
33	Harvard	7	9.90	1
33	Northwestern	3	9.90	1
39	Toledo	5	9.14	1
39	Missouri-St Louis	9	9.14	1
39	Southern Ill-Ed	9	9.14	1
39	Appalachian St	9	9.14	1
39	Rutgers	4	9.14	1
39	Penn State	3.67	9.14	1
39	Rhode Island	2	9.14	1
46	Texas A&M	10	8.98	1
46	San Diego St	10	8.98	1
46	Cal St-San Marc	1	8.98	1
46	George Mason	8	8.98	1
46	Boise St	10	8.98	1

Appendix B-4. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1990

46	North Texas St	13	8.98	1
46	Denver	4	8.98	1
46	Arizona St	9	8.98	1
46	Washington	8	8.98	1
46	Syracuse	3	8.98	1
46	UNC-Greensboro	6	8.98	1
46	Eastern Illinois	5	8.98	1
46	Colorado	5	8.98	1
46	LSU	5	8.98	1
46	Hartford	5	8.98	1
• 46	Naval PGS	17	8.98	1

Appendix B-5. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1989

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	CMU	6	89.10	9
2	NYU	19	62.36	6
3	Minnesota	26	62.27	6
4	Arizona	12	56.15	6
5	Colorado	5	51.18	5
6	Georgia St	15	44.15	4
7	Naval PGS	17	40.96	4
8	Florida	8	36.56	4
9	Georgia	6	36.24	4
10	Massachusetts	5	34.54	3
11	Toledo	5	34.28	4
12	Florida Intl	11	32.59	3
13	UNC-Greensboro	6	32.19	3
14	MIT	12	31.11	3
15	Ohio State	7	31.08	3
16	Syracuse	3	30.95	3
17	San Diego St	10	30.85	3
18	Texas-Austin	14	30.69	3
19	BYU	12	30.03	3
20	Texas Tech	7	27.97	3
21	Baltimore	9	27.42	3
21	Texas-Arlington	8	27.42	3
23	Houston	8	23.66	2
24	SUNY-Albany	3	22.18	2
24	George Mason	8	22.18	2
25	Laval	4	20.07	2
26	Boise St	10	20.02	2
27	Missouri-St Louis	9	18.99	2
28	Mississippi St	5	12.57	1
29	Quebec	6	11.09	1
29	Colorado St	9	11.09	1
29	Florida Atlantic	7	11.09	1
29	Kansas St	7	11.09	1
29	Nevada-Reno	2	11.09	1
29	SUNY-Binghamton	4	11.09	1
29	Delaware	10	11.09	1
29	Maine	2	11.09	1
29	Rice	1	11.09	1
38	Georgia Tech	6	10.88	1
39	Babson College	9	10.01	1
39	South Florida	18	10.01	1
39	Wisconsin-Milw	9	10.01	1
39	Michigan	10	10.01	1
39	Cal St-Fullerton	2	10.01	1
39	Toronto	2	10.01	1
39	Hawaii	5	10.01	1
39	McGill	3	10.01	1
47	SMU	4	9.14	1
47	Indiana	10	9.14	1
47	James Madison	8	9.14	1

47	Case Western	8	9.14	1
51	Ball St	8	8.98	1
51	USC	9	8.98	1
51	Bowling Green St	5	8.98	1
51	Cornell	3	8.98	1
51	TCU	4	8.98	1
51	Boston	8	8.98	1
51	Cincinnati	6	8.98	1
51	McMaster	4	8.98	1

Appendix B-6. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1988

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	Pennsylvania	5	61.59	6
2	Colorado-Denver	6	61.19	6
3	Texas Tech	7	54.82	5
4	USC	9	54.40	5
5	Texas-Austin	14	51.18	5
6	Minnesota	26	49.02	5
7	Ohio State	7	44.30	4
8	Harvard	7	39.93	4
9	Arizona	12	39.01	4
10	Georgia	6	38.14	4
11	Houston	8	36.23	3
12	Queens	4	32.19	3
13	Massachusetts	5	31.86	3
14	MIT	12	29.92	3
15	Toledo	5	29.00	3
16	Bowling Green St	5	28.13	3
17	Purdue	6	23.66	2
18	NYU	19	22.58	2
19	UC-Irvine	9	22.54	2
20	Hawaii	5	22.18	2
20	CMU	6	22.18	2
22	UNC-Greensboro	6	21.71	2
23	UCLA	6	21.55	2
• 24	Naval PGS	17	21.10	2
24	American U	10	21.10	2
24	Temple	3	21.10	2
24	Georgia St	15	21.10	2
28	Rhode Island	2	20.02	2
29	McMaster	4	19.15	2
29	Cincinnati	6	19.15	2
31	Dayton	8	18.99	2
32	Memphis St	8	18.28	2
32	Arkansas	6	18.28	2
34	Illinois Tech	3	12.57	1
34	Ill-Urbana	3	12.57	1
34	BYU	12	12.57	1
34	Baltimore	9	12.57	1
38	North Texas St	13	11.09	1
38	Michigan	10	11.09	1
38	Texas-Arlington	8	11.09	1
38	Laval	4	11.09	1
38	St Cloud St	15	11.09	1
38	Cal St-Dom Hills	4	11.09	1
38	Penn State	3.67	11.09	1
45	Rutgers	4	10.88	1
46	Colorado	5	10.01	1
46	Pittsburgh	9	10.01	1
46	Rensselaer	5	10.01	1
46	Case Western	8	10.01	1
46	McGill	3	10.01	1

Appendix B-6. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1988

51	SMU	4	9.14	1
51	Detroit	2	9.14	1
53	Luther College	2	8.98	1
53	Canisius College	4	8.98	1
53	Western Michigan	3	8.98	1
53	Missouri-St Louis	9	8.98	1
53	Texas A&M	10	8.98	1

Appendix B-7. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1987

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	Ohio State	7	117.04	11
2	Massachusetts	5	64.41	6
3	Pennsylvania	5	50.60	5
4	Toledo	5	42.20	4
5	Minnesota	26	41.57	4
6	Georgia	6	37.98	4
7	Houston	8	36.95	4
8	Queens	4	34.33	3
9	Hawaii	5	32.59	3
10	UC-Irvine	9	32.15	3
11	SUNY-Albany	3	30.85	3
12	Harvard	7	29.92	3
13	NYU	19	29.05	3
14	Georgia St	15	22.18	2
15	Florida	8	21.71	2
16	Texas-Austin	14	21.71	2
17	Cal State	5.08	20.02	2
17	British Columbia	7	20.02	2
19	SMU	4	19.15	2
19	UCLA	6	19.15	2
21	MIT	12	18.12	2
22	Syracuse	3	17.96	2
22	Auburn	9	17.96	2
24	Ill-Urbana	3	12.57	1
24	Ill-Chicago	9	12.57	1
26	CMU	6	11.09	1
27	UTEP	8	10.01	1
27	Delaware	10	10.01	1
27	American U	10	10.01	1
27	Laval	4	10.01	1
27	Bentley College	16	10.01	1
27	Colorado	5	10.01	1
27	Cornell	3	10.01	1
34	Vermont	2	9.14	1
34	North Texas St	13	9.14	1
34	Texas A&M	10	9.14	1
34	Bowling Green St	5	9.14	1
34	Arizona St	9	9.14	1
34	Eastern Michigan	8	9.14	1
34	Wisconsin-Mad	3	9.14	1
34	Missouri-St Louis	9	9.14	1
42	Colorado-ColSpgs	6	8.98	1
42	UNC-Charlotte	2	8.98	1
42	Arizona	12	8.98	1
42	Calgary	12	8.98	1

Appendix B-8. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1986

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	NYU	19	44.36	4
2	Minnesota	26	42.20	4
3	CMU	6	35.15	3
4	SW Texas St	6	33.27	3
4	Florida Atlantic	7	33.27	3
6	UCLA	6	32.19	3
7	Rensselaer	5	22.58	2
8	Miami (FL)	17	22.18	2
9	Ohio State	7	21.97	2
10	Naval PGS	17	21.19	2
11	Case Western	8	21.10	2
12	British Columbia	7	20.02	2
12	Hawaii	5	20.02	2
14	Harvard	7	19.91	2
14	Colorado-ColSpgs	6	19.91	2
16	Ill-Chicago	9	12.57	1
16	Dalhousie	2	12.57	1
16	Texas-Austin	14	12.57	1
19	Georgia Tech	6	11.09	1
19	Houston	8	11.09	1
19	Arizona	12	11.09	1
19	TCU	4	11.09	1
19	Stanford	4	11.09	1
24	Queens	4	10.10	1
25	USC	9	10.01	1
25	Dayton	8	10.01	1
25	Laval	4	10.01	1
25	Oakland	10	10.01	1
25	Florida Intl	11	10.01	1
25	UNC-Greensboro	6	10.01	1
25	McMaster	4	10.01	1
25	MIT	12	10.01	1
25	Waterloo	4	10.01	1
25	American U	10	10.01	1
35	Florida	8	9.97	1
35	Michigan	10	9.97	1
37	Pennsylvania	5	9.90	1
38	Wisconsin-Milw	9	9.14	1
38	Missouri-St Louis	9	9.14	1
38	Arizona St	9	9.14	1
38	Cincinnati	6	9.14	1
38	Penn State	3.67	9.14	1
38	Notre Dame	1	9.14	1

Appendix B-9. Weighted Academic Departmental Rankings-1985

	University	No.Fac	Jrnl Score	No.Art
1	NYU	19	42.16	4
2	SUNY-Albany	3	35.15	3
3	Case Western	8	33.27	3
4	Massachusetts	5	32.85	3
5	UC-Irvine	9	32.15	3
6	Queens	4	31.73	3
7	Missouri-St Louis	9	29.15	3
8	Ohio State	7	23.45	2
9	Minnesota	26	20.02	2
10	James Madison	8	12.57	1
10	British Columbia	7	12.57	1
12	Michigan	10	11.09	1
12	UC-Berkeley	5	11.09	1
12	Pace University	1	11.09	1
12	Temple	3	11.09	1
12	Stanford	4	11.09	1
17	MIT	12	10.01	1
17	Georgia St	15	10.01	1
17	Quebec	6	10.01	1
17	UCLA	6	10.01	1
17	Texas Tech	7	10.01	1
17	Calgary	12	10.01	1
17	Boston	8	10.01	1
24	Pennsylvania	5	9.97	1
25	Arizona	12	9.90	1
25	Harvard	7	9.90	1
27	SMU	4	9.14	1
27	Old Dominion	4	9.14	1

Appendix C. Top Institutional Representation in MIS Literature

Grover, Segars, Simon 1982-1991

	University
1	Minnesota
2	Arizona
3	MIT
4	Texas
5	NYU
6	Georgia
7	USC
8	British Columbia
9	Texas A&M
10	Pittsburgh
11	Boston University
12	Harvard
13	Pennsylvania
14	UCLA
15	Toledo
16	Carnegie Mellon
17	Missouri-St. Louis
18	Colorado-Denver
19	Florida Intl
20	SMU
21	UC-Irvine
22	Houston
23	Colorado-Boulder
24	Case Western
25	McGill
26	Hawaii
27	Renssalaer
28	Dartmouth
29	Indiana
30	Texas Tech
31	Penn State
32	North Carolina
33	SUNY-Albany
34	Tel Aviv
35	Laval
36	Naval PGS
37	American University
38	SUNY-Buffalo
39	Colorado-ColoSpgs
40	Oakland
41	Georgia St
42	Boise St
43	Michigan
44	Missouri-Columbia
45	Wisconsin-Milw
46	Syracuse
47	Arizona St
48	Queen's University
49	Ohio St
50	Northeastern

Appendix D. Hayes and Huskey (1993) IS Journal Prestige Ranking and Weights

Rank	**Journal**	**Weight**
1.	*Management Science*	12.57
2.	*Information systems Research*	11.43
3.	*Communications of the ACM*	11.09
4.	*IEEE Transactions on IS*	10.88
5.	*Admin Science Quarterly*	10.58
6.	*CM Transactions on IS*	10.10
7.	*MIS Quarterly*	10.01
8.	*ACM Survey*	9.97
9.	*Harvard Business Review*	9.90
10.	*Academy of Management Journal*	9.62
11.	*ORSA Journal on Computing*	9.20
12.	*Decision Science*	9.14
13.	*IEEE Computer*	9.04
14.	*Journal of MIS*	8.98
15.	*Sloan Management Review*	8.90
16.	*Accounting Review*	8.58
17.	*Decision Support Systems*	8.40
18.	*Interfaces*	7.91
19.	*Information and Management*	7.53
20.	*Omega*	7.50
21.	*Database*	6.88
22.	*Journal of Systems Management*	6.56
23.	*EDP Analyzer*	5.89
24.	*Datamation*	4.87

LIST OF REFERENCES

Coe, R. and I. Weinstock, "*Evaluating the Management Journals: A Second Look*", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 27, 1984, pp. 660-666.

Davis, G., J. DeGross, R. Littlefield, *1992 Directory Of Management Information Systems Faculty*, MISRC/ McGRAW-HILL, 1992.

Gillenson, M. and J. Stutz, "*Academic Issues in MIS: Journals and Books*", MIS Quarterly, Vol. 15, No. 4, December 1991, pp. 447-452.

Grover, V., A. Segars, S. Simon, "*An Assessment of Institutional Research Productivity in MIS*", Data Base, Fall 1992, pp. 5-9.

Hamilton, S., and B. Ives, "*The Journal Communication System for MIS Research*" Data Base, Winter 1983, pp. 3-14.

Hayes, T., and W. Huskey, "*An Evaluation of Techniques for Ranking Academic IS Journals*", Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, September 1993.

Klemkowsky, R., and D. Tuttle, "*The Institutional Source and Concentration of Financial Research*", Journal of Finance, Vol. 32, No. 3, 1977, pp. 901-907.

Lending, D. and J. Wetherbe, "*Update on MIS Research: A Profile of Leading Journals and U.S. Universities*", Data Base, Vol. 23, No. 3, Summer 1992, pp. 5-11.

Niemi, A., "*Institutional Contributions to the Leading Finance Journals*", Journal of Finance, Vol. 42, No. 5, 1987, pp. 1389-1397.

Niemi, A., "*Publication Performance of Marketing Departments: 1975-1985*", Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1988a, pp. 8-12.

Niemi, A., "*Research Productivity of American Business Schools, 1975-1985*", Review of Business and Economic Research, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1988b, pp. 1-16.

Sharplin, A. and R. Mabry, "*The Relative Importance of Journals Used in Management Research: An Alternative Ranking*", Human Relations, Vol. 38, No. 2, 1985, pp. 139-148.

Stahl, M., T. Leap, Z. Wei, "*Publication in Leading Management Journals as a Measure of Institutional Research Productivity*", Academy of Management Journal, September 1988, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 707-720.

Vogel, D., and J. Wetherbe, "*MIS Research: A Profile of Leading Journals and Universities*", DATABASE, Vol. 16, No. 1, Fall 1984, pp. 3-14.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1.	Professor William J. Haga Administrative Sciences Department AS/HG Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5103	2
2.	Professor Kishore Sengupta Administrative Sciences Department AS/SE Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5103	2
3.	Library, Code 52 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93943-5002	2
4.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22304-6145	2

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

GAYLORD S

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
3 2768 00311338 2